## 355

KANKEL

Organization BIGG/ROOM UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA. 22313-1450

If Undeliverable Return In Ten Days

Penalty For Private Use, \$300 Official Business

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER



RECEIVED

**DEC 0.1** 2008

NOT DELIVERABLE AS ADDRESSED UNABLE TO FORWARD

BC: 22313148050

BHXHX

\*O117-08910-17-08 hibbiding malling the hill mile than the second

22313@1450

STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

The

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

TADEM	NT/			
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/761,511	01/16/2001	Takayuki Hisanaka	2309/01158	5640
DARBY & DA	7590 11/17/2008 RBY P.C.		EXAMINER	
805 Third Avenue new York, NY 10022			ANDERSON, CATHARINE L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3761	
		•	<u></u>	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/761,511	HISANAKA, TAKAYUKI		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Lynne Anderson	3761		

	Lynne Anderson	3761				
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence add	ress –			
THE REPLY FILED 28 October 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.				
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i	).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as			
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
AMENDMENTS  3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, by	out prior to the data of filing a brief	udl pat be entered be				
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further cor</li> </ol>			cause			
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		L 50.011),				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying th	ne issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mnliant Amendment /	PTOL.324)			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inpliant Amendment (i	- 10L-324).			
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmen	t canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov		be entered and an ex	planation of			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	.,					
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:	·					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	before or on the date of filing a No	tice of Appeal will not	be entered			
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	I and/or appellant fails	to provide a			
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary  10.   The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation						
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	·					
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:			
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).					
/Tatyana Zalukaeva/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3761						

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

Application No. 09/761,511

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments have been considered but are not persuasive.

In response to the applicant's argument that Ehmsperger fails to disclose the melting point of the support layer, it is noted that Ehmsperger discloses a support layer comprising the same material, polyethylene oxide, as the claimed invention. Since the material disclosed by Ehrnsperger has the same chemical composition of the claimed invention, it must have the same properties (i.e. the same melting point). (see MPEP 2112.01(II))